

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed July 2, 2007. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 13-20 and 34-49 are pending in this application, with claims 13, 34, and 42 being the independent claims. Claims 34-49 have been withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 16 have been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 13 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0012] and FIG. 2. Claim 16 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of written description and enablement. Specifically, the Office Action objects to the step in independent claim 13 of “selecting multiple vertices” of the arc without first dividing the arc into segments that have vertices. In response, claim 13 has been amended to add this step. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13, as well as dependent claims 14-20, fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. As noted above in the discussion of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, claim 13 has been amended to add the allegedly omitted step. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13, as well as dependent claims 14-20, fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13, 14, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,621,451 to Fisher et al. (“Fisher”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0263516 to Michail et al. (“Michail”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 13 recites “completely representing the trapezoids as triangles.” The Office Action acknowledges that Fisher fails to disclose “representing the trapezoids as triangles” and cites Michail. However, Michail does not disclose or suggest completely representing the trapezoids as triangles. Michail merely discloses utilizing triangles at the edge areas of the trapezoids. (see, e.g., Michail, paragraph [0065] and FIG. 9). Accordingly, claim 13 distinguishes over Fisher and Michail.

Claims 14, 15, and 20 depend on claim 13 and distinguish over Fisher and Michail at least for that reason. Moreover, claims 14, 15, and 20 recite elements that additionally distinguish over the cited references.

For example, claim 15 recites “wherein the line profile comprises at least one texel column transitioning from dark to light to dark.” The Office Action cites paragraphs [0069] and [0070] of Michail as teaching this element, but Michail only generally discloses the interpolation shading of the edges. Michail does not disclose or suggest a line profile that includes a texel column transitioning from dark to light to dark.

Claim 20 recites “wherein texture is rectangular, and is mapped into the trapezoid such that each column of the rectangular texture is mapped along a radial bounded by the top and bottom of the trapezoids.” The Office Action cites Fisher as teaching this element. Particularly, the Office Action states that “mapping occurs along a radial bounded by the top and bottom of the assigned range bin.” Even assuming that this is correct, claim 20 requires that each column of the rectangular texture is mapped along a radial bounded by the top and bottom of the trapezoids. The range bins of the system in Fisher do not correspond to trapezoids.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher and Michail, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0263516 to Mukoyama et al. (“Mukoyama”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Mukoyama fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 16 distinguishes over Fisher, Michail, and Mukoyama at least for depending on claim 13.

Moreover, claim 16 recites elements that additionally distinguish over the cited

references. Claim 16 recites “the texture is symmetrical with respect to a midline of the trapezoids.” Mukoyama discloses that the polygons themselves can be arranged in a symmetrical manner about a central axis, but Mukoyama does not disclose or suggest that the textures are arranged in a symmetrical manner with respect to the midline of the polygons (or trapezoids).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher and Michail, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,861 to Ikedo. (“Ikedo”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Ikedo fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 17 distinguishes over Fisher, Michail, and Ikedo at least for depending on claim 13.

Moreover, claim 17 recites elements that additionally distinguish over the cited references. Claim 17 recites “applying a reverse perspective view transformation to individual columns of texels of the texture.” Ikedo discloses interleaving techniques, but does not disclose or suggest applying a reverse perspective view transformation to individual columns of texels of the texture. Particularly, column 5, lines 45-51 of Ikedo, which are specifically cited in the Office Action, do not disclose or suggest these elements.

Claim 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher and Michail, and further in view of “Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice, Second Edition” by Foley (“Foley”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Foley fails to cure the deficiency of the rejection of claim 13 discussed above, and claim 18 and 19 distinguish over Fisher, Michail, and Foley at least for depending on claim 13.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Appl. No. 10/671,099
Amdt. Dated October 2, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 2, 2007

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: October 2, 2007

By: /CHAD C. ANDERSON, REG. NO. 44505/
Chad C. Anderson
(480) 385-5060